UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/576,789	06/07/2006	Yohei Hasegawa	040405-0378	5929

22428 7590 05/04/2010

FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP
SUITE 500
3000 K STREET NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER	
ZHAO, WEI	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2475	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/04/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/576,789	HASEGAWA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	WEI ZHAO	2475	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 November 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-57* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-57* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This communication is considered fully responsive to the Amendment filed on November 16, 2009.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) The invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims1, 6, 8, 14-15, 17, 22, 24, 30-31, 33, 38, 40, 46-47 and 50-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dorward et al (US 20030018878 A1).

For claim 1, Dorward et al discloses a communication device (Fig. 2 shows server 104) comprising: a memory (Fig. 2 shows a memory 202); and a processor (Fig. 2 shows a processor 200), wherein the processor is configured to execute instructions stored in the memory to a function of storing (memory 202 stores one or more software programs which are executable by the processor 200 in conjunction with provision of the archival data storage techniques see [0025] lines 1-10) divide original data into a plurality of blocks (the server 104, the storage of data blocks is separated from the index used to locate the blocks, as is also apparent from FIG. 1. More particularly,

blocks are stored in an append-only log on storage element 116. See [0041] lines1-5 and Fig. 5) and store information within a header for restoring the plurality of blocks to the original data (Each data block is prefixed by a header, denoted headers.sub.0, header.sub.I; etc.that describes the contents of the corresponding block. The primary purpose of the block header is to provide integrity checking during normal operation and to assist in data recovery see [0043] lines 1-9).

For claim 6, it is similar to claim 1. Claim 6 is rejected for the same reasons as to claim 1.

For claim 8, Dorward et al discloses a communication device (Fig. 2 shows server 104), wherein the information stored within the header is stored in an option field (header 308 of fig. 3 shows fields) option the header (Each data block is prefixed by a header, denoted headers.sub.0, header.sub.I, etc.that describes the contents of the corresponding block. The primary purpose of the block header is to provide integrity checking during normal operation and to assist in data recovery see [0043] lines 4-9).

For claim 14, Dorward et al discloses a communication device (Fig. 2 shows server 104), wherein the processor (Fig. 2 shows a processor 200) is further configured to execute instructions to transfer the plurality of blocks (memory 202 stores one or more software programs which are executable by the processor 200 in conjunction with provision of the archival data storage techniques see [0025] lines 7- 10) based on a communication rate (The write performance of the server is therefore limited to the

random access performance of the index 114, speedup in throughput can be achieved by striping the index see [0055] lines 8-15).

For claim 15, Dorward et al discloses a communication device (Fig. 2 shows server 104), wherein the original data is configured to be restored by referring to the information for restoring the plurality of blocks to the original data within the header (Each data block is prefixed by a header, denoted headers.sub.0, header.sub.I, etc.that describes the contents of the corresponding block. The primary purpose of the block header is to provide integrity checking during normal operation and to assist in data recovery see [0043] lines 4-9).

For claims 17 and 22, they both are similar to claim 1. Claims 17 and 22 are rejected for the same reasons as to claim 1.

For claim 24, it is similar to claim 8. Claim 24 is rejected for the same reasons as to claim 8.

For claims 30 and 31, they are similar to claims 14 and 15 individually. Claims 30 and 31 are rejected for the same reasons as applied to claims 14 and 15.

For claims 33 and 38, they both are similar to claim 1. Claims 33 and 38 are rejected for the same reasons as to claim 1.

For claim 40, it is similar to claim 8. Claim 40 is rejected for the same reasons as to claim 8.

For claims 46 and 47, these two claims are similar to claims 14 and 15 individually. Claims 46 and 47 are rejected for the same reasons as applied to claims 14 and 15.

For claim 50, Dorward et al discloses a communication device (Fig. 2 shows server 104), wherein the communication device is a proxy server (the server 104 may be distributed across multiple machines. The approach of identifying data by a hash of its contents simplifies such an extension. Such load balancing could even be hidden from the client application by interposing a proxy server that performs this operation on behalf of the client see [0076] lines 1-10).

For claim 51, Dorward et al discloses a communication device (Fig. 2 shows server 104), wherein the information stored within the header comprises a sequence number and a block size (A given block header 308 includes a "magic" number, the fingerprint of the data block, a user-supplied type identifier, the size of the data block, the identity of the client device or other user that wrote the data block, and the time when the block was first written, the latter being denoted "wtime." See [0045] lines 1-6).

For claims 53-54, these two claims are similar to claims 50-51 individually. Claims 53-54 are rejected for the same reasons as to claims 50-51.

For claims 56-57, they are similar to claims 50-51 individually. Claims 56-57 are rejected for the same reasons as to claims 50-51.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. Claims 2-5, 7, 9, 12-13, 18-21, 23, 25, 34-37, 39, 41, 44-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorward et al (US 20030018878 A1) in view of Firestone (US 6965646 B1).

For claim 2, Dorward et al discloses a communication device (Fig. 2 shows server 104), wherein the information for restoring the plurality of blocks to the original data is stored in an option field (header 308 of fig. 3 shows fields) within the header (Each data block is prefixed by a header, denoted headers.sub.0, header.sub.l, etc.that describes the contents of the corresponding block. The primary purpose of the block

header is to provide integrity checking during normal operation and to assist in data recovery see [0043] lines 4-9).

Dorward et al teach all the subject matter with the exception of implementing the header of the transport protocol. Firestone from the same or similar endeavor teach (The network packet header includes additional information useful for transmission in the network 106. An input buffer 108 may also be included for temporarily holding the data before streaming onto the network 106. Upon request, the network interface 105 sends the packetized RTP packets onto the network 106 in real-time see coin: 1 line 57-63). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the method of Firestone in the system of Dorward et al. The method of Dorward et al can be implemented on any type of method wherein the header is a header of the transport protocol which is taught by Firestone with a motivation in order to reformatting MPEG data within RTP packets and streams the data onto the network for real-time playback.

For claim 3, Dorward et al disclose a communication device (Fig. 2 shows server 104). Dorward et al. teach all the subject matter with the exception of implementing the processor further configured to execute instructions to examine maximum values of a packet size allowed by a connection related to communication and unify the smallest size among the packet size maximum values as a maximum value of an allowable packet size. Firestone from the same or similar endeavor teach (The packetizer 104 will fragment or aggregate media packets into network packets according to their respective sizes. Media packets are generally described as constant-sized packets containing either video or audio data. Specifically, if the size of a media packet in media file 102 is

larger than the optimal network packet size, the packetizer 104 will fragment the large media packet into two or more successive network packets. On the other hand, if the size of a media packet in media file 102 is smaller than the optimal network packet size, packetizer 104 may aggregate two or more media packets into a single network packet see col: 2 lines 49-59and fig. 1A). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the method of Firestone in the system of Dorward et al. The method of Dorward et al can be implemented on any type of method wherein the processor further configured to execute instructions to examine maximum values of a packet size allowed by a connection related to communication and unify the smallest size among the packet size maximum values as a maximum value of an allowable packet size which is taught by Firestone with a motivation to order to modify and reformat MPEG stream to facilitate RTP packetization.

For claim 4, Dorward et al disclose a communication device (Fig. 2 shows server 104). Dorward et al. teach all the subject matter with the exception of implementing the method, wherein the processor is further configured to execute instructions to examine maximum values of a packet size allowed by a connection related to communication and communicate with a packet size equal to or less than the smallest size among the packet size maximum values. Firestone from the same or similar endeavor teach (The packetizer 104 will fragment or aggregate media packets into network packets according to their respective sizes. Media packets are generally described as constant-sized packets containing either video or audio data. Specifically, if the size of a media packet in media file 102 is larger than the optimal network packet size, the packetizer

104 will fragment the large media packet into two or more successive network packets. On the other hand, if the size of a media packet in media file 102 is smaller than the optimal network packet size, packetizer 104 may aggregate two or more media packets into a single network packet see col: 2 lines 49-59and fig. 1A). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the method of Firestone in the system of Dorward et al. The method of Dorward et al can be implemented on any type of method wherein the processor is further configured to execute instructions to examine maximum values of a packet size allowed by a connection related to communication and communicate with a packet size equal to or less than the smallest size among the packet size maximum values which is taught by Firestone with a motivation to order to modify and reformat MPEG stream to facilitate RTP packetization.

For claim 5, Dorward et al disclose a communication device (Fig. 2 shows server 104). Dorward et al. teach all the subject matter with the exception of implementing the system, wherein a data length is stored as information for restoring the original data. Firestone from the same or similar endeavor teaches the network packet information inside each GOP header 304 contains the starting byte indexes and lengths of each RTP data packet from the GOP. By knowing the exactlocation of each MPEG file data packet, the streamer 250 may expeditiously copy the data in blocks when repacketizing from the MPEG file to RTP packets (see col: 10 lines 16-22). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the method of Firestone in the system of Dorward et al. The method of Dorward et al can be implemented on any type of method wherein a data length is stored as information for restoring the original data

which is taught by Firestone with a motivation in order to modify and reformat MPEG stream to facilitate RTP packetization.

For claim 7, Dorward et al discloses a communication device (Fig. 2 shows server 104). Dorward et al. teach all the subject matter with the exception of implementing the system, wherein the header is a header of the transport protocol .Firestone from the same or similar endeavor teach (The network packet header includes additional information useful for transmission in the network 106. An input buffer 108 may also be included for temporarily holding the data before streaming onto the network 106. Upon request, the network interface 105 sends the packetized RTP packets onto the network 106 in real-time see coin: 1 lines 57-63). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the method of Firestone in the system of Dorward et al. The method of Dorward et al can be implemented on any type of method wherein the header is a header of the transport protocol which is taught by Firestone with a motivation in order to reformatting MPEG data within RTP packets and streams the data onto the network for real-time playback.

For claim 9, Dorward et al. teach all the subject matter with the exception of implementing the system, wherein the information stored within the header is stored in a part of a timestamp field of an option field within the header. Firestone from the same or similar endeavor teach (The RTP header contains RTP header information used by the streamer 250 before the data is sent onto the network 204. In one embodiment, the RTP header may include RTP header parameters specified later upon streaming. Subsequently, upon transmission onto the network 204, these RTP header parameters

may be modified by the streamer 250. By way of example, each RTP packet sent onto the network 204 contains a sequence number and an RTP timestamp see coin: 12 lines 4-12) Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the method of Firestone in the system of Dorward et al. The method of Dorward et al can be implemented on any type of method the stored in a part of a timestamp field of an option field within the header which is taught by Firestone with a motivation in order to reformatting MPEG data within RTP packets and streams the data onto the network for real-time playback.

For claim 12, Dorward et al. teach all the subject matter with the exception of implementing the system, wherein the processor is configured to execute instructions stored in the memory to examine Maximum Transfer Unit (MTU) usable by the plurality of connections by a path MTU discovery option and unify MTU of the respective connections to the smallest MTU obtained by the examination. Firestone from the same or similar endeavor teach wherein the processor is configured to execute instructions stored in the memory to examine Maximum Transfer Unit (MTU) (The segmentor 222 will create network packets that have as many bytes as possible without going over the MTU size. To create the network packets, the segmenter 222 reads data out of the audio buffer 211 and video buffer 213. Typically, the system stream 202, its corresponding elementary video stream 210 and the elementary audio stream 208 contain constant sized MPEG packets.see coin: 8 lines 43-50) usable by the plurality of connections by a path MTU discovery option and unify MTU of the respective connections to the smallest MTU obtained by the examination (if the size of a media

packet in media file 102 is smaller than the optimal network packet size, packetizer 104 may aggregate two or more media packets into a single network packet see col: 2 lines 56-59. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the method of Firestone in the system of Dorward et al. The method of Dorward et al can be implemented on any type of method wherein the processor is configured to execute instructions stored in the memory to examine Maximum Transfer Unit (MTU) usable by the plurality of connections by a path MTU discovery option and unify MTU of the respective connections to the smallest MTU obtained by the examination which is taught by Firestone with a motivation in order to reformatting MPEG data within RTP packets and streams the data onto the network for real-time playback.

For claim 13, Dorward et al. teach all the subject matter with the exception of implementing the system, wherein the processor is configured to execute instructions stored in the memory to refer to a data length to restore the plurality of blocks to the original data. Firestone from the same or similar endeavor teaches (the network packet information inside each GOP header 304 contains the starting byte indexes and lengths of each RTP data packet from the GOP. By knowing the exactlocation of each MPEG file data packet, the streamer 250 may expeditiously copy the data in blocks when repacketizing from the MPEG file to RTP packets see col: 10 lines 16-22). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the method of Firestone in the system of Dorward et al .The method of Dorward et al can be implemented on any type of method refer to a data length to restore the plurality of

blocks to the original data which is taught by Firestone with a motivation in order to modify and reformat MPEG stream to facilitate RTP packetization.

For claims 18-21, these four claims are similar to claims 2-5 individually. Claims 18-21 are rejected for the same reasons as to claims 2-5.

For claims 23 and 25, these two claims are similar to claims 7 and 9 individually. Claims 23 and 25 are rejected for the same reasons as to claims 7 and 9.

For claims 28 and 29, these two claims are similar to claims 12 and 13 individually. Claims 28 and 29 are rejected for the same reasons as to claims 12 and 13.

For claims 34-37, these four claims are similar to claims 2-5 individually. Claims 34-37 are rejected for the same reasons as to claims 2-5.

For claims 39 and 41, they are similar to claims 7 and 9 individually. Claims 39 and 41 are rejected for the same reasons as to claims 7 and 9.

For claims 44 and 45, these two claims are similar to claims 12 and 13. Claims 44 and 45 are rejected for the same reasons as to claims 12 and 13.

7. Claims 10-11, 26-27 and 42-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorward et al (US 20030018878 A1) in view of Itakura et al (20030118107 A1).

For claim 10, Dorward et al. teach all the subject matter with the exception of implementing the system, wherein the header is an IP header. Itakura et al from the same or similar endeavor teach (An IP header is further added to the packet to which the RTP header has been added. FIG. 14 shows details of the IP header in an IP packet. The IP header includes a version, such as IPv4 or IPv6, a header length, a type-of-service (TOS) field which stores priority-level information, a packet length, an identification, a flag indicating control information related to data division (fragment) in an IP layer, a fragment offset indicating the location of divided (fragmented) data, time to live (TTL) indicating the information of time until the data is discarded see [0140] lines 1-10). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the method of Itakura et al in the system of Dorward et al. The method of Dorward et al can be implemented on any type of method wherein stored within the header is an IP header which is taught by Itakura with a motivation to efficiently process data by referring to the priority level information specified in an IP header.

For claim 11, Dorward et al. teach all the subject matter with the exception of implementing the system, wherein information for restoring the plurality of blocks to the original data is stored in a fragment field within an IP header. Itakura et al from the same or similar endeavor teach (An IP header is further added to the packet to which the RTP header has been added. FIG. 14 shows details of the IP header in an IP packet. The IP header includes a version, such as IPv4 or IPv6, a header length, a type-of-service (TOS) field which stores priority-level information, a packet length, an identification, a flag indicating control information related to data division (fragment) in

an IP layer, a fragment offset indicating the location of divided (fragmented) data, time to live (TTL)indicating the information of time until the data is discarded see [0140] lines 1-10). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the method of Itakura et al in the system of Dorward et al. The method of Dorward et al can be implemented on any type of method wherein information for restoring the plurality of blocks to the original data is stored in a fragment field within an IP header which is taught by Itakura with a motivation to efficiently process data by referring to the priority level information specified in an IP header.

For claims 26 and 27, they are similar to claims 10 and 11 individually. Claims 26 and 27 are rejected for the same reasons as to claims 10 and 11.

For claims 42 and 43, they are similar to claims 10 and 11 individually. Claims 42 and 43 are rejected for the same reasons as to claims 10 and 11.

8. Claims 16, 32, 48, 49, 52 and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorward et al (US 20030018878 A1) in view of Asai (US 20030169759 A1).

For claim 16, Dorward et al. teach all the subject matter with the exception of implementing the system, wherein the processor is further configured to execute instructions to reduce a volume of data to be transferred to when a TCP communication rate is low, and increase the volume of data to be transferred to when the TCP communication rate becomes high. Asai from the same or similar endeavor teach (the

processing performed by the receiving end communication equipment, the received data is temporarily transferred to the receiving window and then transferred to the buffer designated by the application task. As a result, the number of times of data transfer increases. Due to this, load on the CPU and hardware necessary for the TCP/IP protocol processing increases to thereby disadvantageously increase power consumption, and it is difficult to secure an empty size in the receiving window of the receiving end communication equipment to thereby disadvantageously decrease data communication rate see[0008]. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the method of Asai in the system of Dorward et al. The method of Dorward et al can be implemented on any type of method the processor is further configured to execute instructions to reduce a volume of data to be transferred to when a TCP communication rate is low, and increase the volume of data to be transferred to when the TCP communication rate becomes high which is taught by Asai with a motivation to increasing a communication processing rate if data is received from a network using TCP/IP.

For claims 32, 48, 49, 52 and 55, these five claims are similar to claim 16. Claims 32, 48, 49, 52 and 55 are rejected for the same reasons as to claim 16.

Response to Remarks/Arguments

9. Claim 112 2nd Rejections: Applicants amended claims for the purpose of correcting the antecedent issues. Therefore, the previous claim rejections under 112, 2nd paragraph are withdrawn.

10. Claim Art Rejections: Applicants' arguments filed November 16, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On pages 9-10 of the Response with respects to claim 1, Applicants assert the prior art doesn't teach "a memory; and a processor, wherein the processor is configured to execute instructions stored in the memory to divide original data into a plurality of blocks, and store information within a header for restoring the plurality of blocks to the original data."

The prior art teaches that in the implementation of the server 104, **the storage of data blocks is separated from the index used to locate the blocks, as is also apparent from FIG. 1**. More particularly, blocks are stored in an append-only log on storage element 116, the storage element being in the form of a RAID array of magnetic disk drives (paragraph [0041] lines 1-6, Dorward et al.). FIG. 2 is a simplified block diagram of one possible implementation of the server 104. In this implementation, the server 104 includes **a processor 200 coupled to a memory 202 and to a network interface** 204. The memory 202 may comprise elements 110, 112, 114 and 116 of the server 104, and may be distributed over multiple distinct storage devices. Moreover, memory 202 stores one or more software programs which are executable by the processor 200 in conjunction with provision of the archival data storage techniques

described herein (paragraph [0025] lines 1-10, Dorward et al.). The prior art further teaches that data blocks are of variable size, up to a current limit of 52 Kbytes, but since blocks are immutable they can be densely packed into an arena without fragmentation. **Each data block is prefixed by a header, denoted headers.sub.0, header.sub.1, etc., that describes the contents of the corresponding block (Examiner's Notes: this feature has the same function of "wherein the processor is configured to execute instructions stored in the memory to divide original data into a plurality of blocks, and store information within a header for restoring the plurality of blocks to the original data" as described in the current application).** The primary purpose of the block header is to provide integrity checking during normal operation and to assist in data recovery (paragraph [0043] lines 1-9, Dorward et al.).

Based on the fact, Examiner respectfully disagrees that the prior art cited does not teach the independent claim 1 as mentioned by applicants. The elements of independent claims 6, 17, 22, 33 and 38 that Applicants argue are similar to claim 1's, so the cited passages also teach claims 6, 17, 22, 33 and 38. Furthermore, the cited passages teach dependent claims 2-5, 7-16, 18-21, 23-32, 34-37, and 39-57 as well.

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to WEI ZHAO whose telephone number is (571)270-5672. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dang Ton can be reached on 571-272-3171. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Wei Zhao
Examiner
Art Unit 2475

/W. Z./
Examiner, Art Unit 2475

/DANG T TON/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2475/D. T. T./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2475